

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

CONNIE SHIVNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CV No. 20-497 RB/CG

CORRVALUES, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING WITHDRAWAL OF COUNSEL

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the unopposed *Motion to Withdraw as Counsel* (the “Motion”), (Doc. 70), filed by Plaintiff’s counsel on October 6, 2021. Plaintiff’s counsel indicates that “Plaintiff no longer wishes for Lopez, Dietzel, Perkins, P.C. to represent her in this matter.” *Id.* at 1. However, as Plaintiff’s lone remaining counsel-of-record, counsel fails to include either “notice of appointment of substitute attorney; or a statement of [Plaintiff’s] intention to appear *pro se* and [Plaintiff’s] address and telephone number[.]” D.N.M. LR-Civ. 83.8(a).¹ Therefore, the Court finds that the Motion shall be **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that counsel’s *Motion to Withdraw as Counsel*, (Doc. 70), is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



THE HONORABLE CARMEN E. GARZA
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The Court previously permitted the Weems Law Firm to withdraw from its representation of Plaintiff without requiring substitution of counsel or a statement of Plaintiff’s intent to proceed *pro se*, because the Lopez, Diezel, Perkins, P.C. law firm remained in the case as Plaintiff’s counsel-of-record. See (Doc. 69).